DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 323 CS 205 837

AUTHOR Barnes, Douglas
TITLE Language Across the Curriculum: The Teacher as Reflective Professional.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 17p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English (13th, Halifax, Canada, August 18-22, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Classroom Communication; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Language Acquisition; *Language Skills; *Learning Processes; Linguistics; Oral Language; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Writing (Composition)

ABSTRACT

Many issues relating to the teaching of language across the curriculum (LAC) are considered in this paper. Among the topics discussed are: (1) language development as a goal of teaching; (2) the use of language activities, including exploratory talking and writing, as a means of learning; (3) issues in which teachers might interest themselves to extend their understanding of language and learning; (4) the contribution of linguistics to language across the curriculum; and (5) some strategies for in-school development of LAC. The paper relates a number of anecdotes to illustrate the points discussed. (GT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192323

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

LANGUAGE ACROSS THE CURRICULUM:

The Teacher As Reflective Professional

Douglas Barnes

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Douglas Barnes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS205237

LANGUAGE ACROSS THE CURRICULUM : THE TEACHER AS REFLECTIVE PROFESSIONAL

1. I am uneasily aware that teachers come to Summer vacation conferences to be inspired, and I am uncertain of my qualifications for that task. Indeed I am convinced of the educational importance of Language Across the Curriculum, yet I am also aware of pitfalls. If I cannot inspire you, perhaps I can at least help you to reflect.

2. What is Language Across the Curriculum about? I can see three aspects of language in schools that we might wish to concern ourselves with. One is language as a goal of teaching. Teachers in elementary schools and English specialists in high schools will see the development of their students' language skills as part of their daily responsibilities. Other high school teachers may not see this as part of their work, though of course it is. The second aspect of language in schools that I want to direct your attention to is the use of language as a means of learning. I am not here referring to the language teachers use but to the idea that putting into words our half-grasped intuitions is an important part of learning. This is to view learning not as adding new information to our collection but as reshaping our view of the world by formulating and reformulating our thoughts aloud or on paper. The third aspect of language in schools I shall not have time to deal with in detail, though it is both important and interesting. Language in school acts as a means of social control, so that students learn from the classroom dialogue what it is to be 'a good pupil'. It is part of what some writers have called the hidden curriculum. One aspect of this is the possibility that a student with one kind of accent may receive different treatment from that received by a student who speaks with another accent. Some of you may feel that this is a very important part of LAC indeed.

I propose to talk briefly about the first of these three - language as a goal of learning - and then devote more time to language as a means of learning - talking to learn, or writing to learn. In spite of my using these phrases it occurs to me that the word 'language' is potentially misleading, since what we are led towards is a critical reconsideration of

/patterns

patterns of communication in the classroom, the kinds of learning activities we ask of our students, and our own teaching styles. LAC may even raise disturbing questions about the nature of learning and of knowledge and about the purpose of education. Strictly linguistic issues play only a small part in all this. So radical a self-questioning is inevitably disturbing to ourselves and our colleagues, so, after saying something about:

i. Language development as a goal of schooling, and

ii. Language as a means of learning

I shall go on to talk about:

iii. Some of the issues that teachers might address themselves to.

iv. The contribution of linguistics to LAC.

v. Some strategies for in-school development in LAC.

3. Language development as a goal of schooling

Perhaps an anecdote might be forgiven to introduce what I have to say about language development as a goal of education. Last year three teachers - students - came to me wanting to study children's language development, so I set them reading works on language acquisition in syntax, phonology, semantics and some of the new work on the acquisition of pragmatics. They eventually came up to me and said, 'This reading we've been doing is very interesting, but when are we going to start on language development?' To my dismay it turned out that by 'language development' they had meant 'How should we teach English?', not 'How do children acquire language?'. Since most of the research on language acquisition ends at the age when schooling begins, there was not indeed a great deal of direct relevance to teaching in the work we had done together, yet there were indirect implications. For example, the absurdity of seeing language development in terms of increasing vocabulary had become obvious in the light of the complexity of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of acquisition. Again, it had become clear that young children do not acquire speech by passive imitation of linguistic forms but from their urgent desire to communicate their own meanings and intentions. Active participation in dialogue came to the centre of the picture, and the importance to the learner of trying to say

/(or to

(or to write) something that matters to him, and (what is more) to say it to someone who wants to hear and understand it. Clearly this has implications for teaching, by emphasising the importance not only for language but for all learning of young people talking, reading and writing about things that make sense to them. As far as is possible in schools the talking, reading and writing should be for real, and not what Jimmy Britton calls 'dummy runs'. (When Bryant Fillion in his paper in the McGill Journal of Education quotes Courtney Cazden's warning about "too much attention to drill on the component skills of language and literacy and too little attention to their significant use" this must be what he too is concerned about.) My students also learned about the importance of the teacher as a good listener who is interested in what the students say and replies to it rather than just evaluating it. So all their time was not wasted.

But I don't want to imply that all that is needed is lively talk and writing about topics that matter to students: there is more to it than that. The ability to reflect, to criticise, to consider alternatives is essential to our education. The anthropologist Jack Goody argues in his book The Domestication of the Savage Mind that it has been literacy that has given to Western culture the tool of reflective criticism. This is what a teacher is enhancing when he or she asks: Why put it in those words? What difference would it make to say 'exhausted' rather than 'tired'?

But of course I am not talking only about encouraging students to reflect about language. It is part of our business as educators in any part of the curriculum to ask them questions such as: 'Can you think of other possibilities?' 'Have you any evidence for saying so?' And then to give them tasks which require them to ask such questions for themselves. I add this note about reflectiveness in case what I said a moment ago about talking and writing 'for real' should suggest the naively romantic 'self-education' view that I have at times been credited with. I do think teaching is important, but we don't always do it with sufficient awareness of the learner's ability to contribute.

How do these considerations fit into LAC? One hears colleagues complain

about the quality of students' written work - or about their failure to take part in class discussion - as if this were entirely independent of the context set up in the classroom. We all need to take more responsibility for what language tasks mean to our students - how they interpret their purpose, what kind of audience we provide for their writing, whether we are good listeners, and so on. An important aspect of LAC will be persuading our colleagues that it is part of their responsibility to set up a range of classroom contexts and tasks that give support to good writing and good talk.

4. Language as a Means of Learning. I now turn my attention to the second function of language, talking and writing as a means of learning. This is the aspect which for me is central to LAC.

Many years ago Jerome Bruner wrote:

> ".....teaching is vastly facilitated by the medium of language, which ends by being not only the medium of exchange but the instrument the learner can use himself in bringing order into the environment."

Her Majesty's Inspectors in a recent report upon secondary schools in England and Wales wrote that "at the centre of many difficulties and differences of view there lies a confusion between two functions of language - the first as communication of what has been learnt and the second as part of the activity of learning itself. Concentration on the first of these at the expense of the second, which is often more important, may obscure the stages of misunderstanding, approximation and correction through which the learner often needs to pass....." I think that puts it very clearly: "the stages of misunderstanding, approximation and correction through which the learner needs to pass". My attention was first directed to these issues in 1966 at a conference of the London Association for the Teaching of English at which Harold Rosen played tape recordings of groups of eleven year olds so that we could discuss the speech strategies they used for coping with different social situations, and Dennis Lawton - then a research student at the London Institute of Education but now its deputy director - summarised published research on small groups and their effect on learning. At that conference

/our

our attention was focussed upon how the social context of communication influenced students' speech and writing, and thereby influenced what they learnt: a few months later I moved from school to university teaching and this theme came to shape my own work. It was not until another similar conference two years later in 1968 that the name 'LAC' was invented. In the event it has not perhaps proved an altogether happy invention, since it does not make clear that what we are primarily concerned with is talking, writing and reading as means of learning, and not language for its own sake. 'Language for Learning' might have been a more informative slogan.

Those of you who are familiar with the arguments which lie behind this movement will bear with me while I rehearse them again. The argument runs like this. We all want something better than rote learning for our pupils. I often find it useful to distinguish between 'school knowledge' and 'action knowledge'. School knowledge is the kind that we know at the surface of our minds, which we can use for tests or answering teacher's questions, but which has not become so integrated with our view of the world that it shapes our actions, that is, it becomes what I call action knowledge. A trivial example is that although all adults know that under standard conditions water boils at 100°C., one nevertheless notices people leaving kettles to boil for a moment or two in the hope that the water will be hotter. Clearly it is action knowledge that we value for our students, but how are we going to help them to bring the new knowledge so into relation with their existing view of the world that the one changes the other. Such changes take time, to allow for trying out of one way of looking or another, and exchanging ideas with other people. Some of this may for some students go on subliminally, but in schools we like to encourage these processes by explicit verbalisation. Lying behind what I am saying is of course a Piagetian view of learning as the modification and reforming of interpretive schemes, students using new ideas to work on and revise their existing preconceptions about how the world is.

When I ask myself to be more explicit about the ways in which verbalising contributes to these processes I find myself recollecting a science lesson I

/saw

saw some years ago in what we call a Middle School. A class of ten year olds was studying air pressure. Apparatus had been set out round the Science Lab. and the students went in groups of three from one task to another. I stood near one piece of apparatus that consisted of a pivoted bar at each end of which was fastened a plastic bag, inverted with the opening at the bottom. The instructions told the students to hold a lighted candle under one bag, observe what happened, remove the candle, observe what happened, and then to explain what they had observed. I listened to how the students attempted this. None did it very well but I could see what functions language was potentially playing in this problem solving task. First they had to retrieve from memory suitable explanatory schemes - in this case about hot air being lighter and rising, and about the effect of unequal forces on a balance. It was a matter of finding a verbal form for ideas that had become vague and little more than intuitions. The second step was to relate these explanatory schemes to one another and to the apparatus in question: how did ideas about seesaws relate to bars and plastic bags? Finally, their talk helped them to evaluate one another's suggestions, and decide which made better sense. It was these three processes - retrieving explanatory schemes, applying, and evaluating them - that seemed to be facilitated by talk. I have called this talk 'exploratory' because it is usually relatively undogmatic; it allows for tentativeness, and false starts. One doesn't have to pay too high a price for vagueness and mistakes. It can be contrasted with presentational or 'final draft' talk, which is appropriate for occasions such as a lecture when the audience can reasonably expect a high level of explicitness, clarity and organisation.

At this point I should perhaps give an example of what I mean by exploratory talk. Notice how in the dialogue that follows the two boys collaborate to formulate and reformulate what they believe to be happening, becoming more explicit as the exchange proceeds. The two ten year old boys are trying to draw on a blackboard the shape of drops of water from a dripping tap.

P2 It's something in the region of round with a point at that side.

/P1

P1 If it is, and that's going down like that, that will probably catch up with that (pointing) ... and so it would be more round.

P2 (drawing) It's like that... when it's dropping.

P1 It's getting straighter.

P2 It's getting rounder, I think.

P1 It'll be more round as the air pushes up, won't it?

A similar distinction between exploratory and presentational functions can be applied, of course, to written language. We are not very good at teaching young people to use exploratory language, especially in writing. What I am talking about is of course the use of talk and writing as heuristic devices. If we do not encourage students to explore how the new knowledge we present to them relates to how they understand the world - to their existing knowledge, that is - then we will leave them with school knowledge only, knowledge that has never penetrated to the sources of their actions.

Teaching without exploratory talk and writing expects pupils to arrive without having travelled. As the Bullock report said:
"It has..... become clear what difficulties face the teacher if he is to encourage genuine exploration and learning on the part of his pupils, and not simply the game of guessing what he has in mind. What the teacher has in mind may well be the desirable destination of a thinking process; but a learner needs to trace the steps from the familiar to the new, from the fact or idea he possesses to that which he is to acquire. In other words, the learner has to make a journey in thought for himself."

In order to achieve this, it will be necessary to change radically not only our views of classroom language but of knowledge itself. As one teacher quoted in Michael Marland's book Language Across the Curriculum wrote, we shall have to "change our attitude to the learning process so as to centre our approach on the experience of learning rather than on our perception of what they (the students) need to know". This then is what I see as the centre of LAC: that teachers should be aware that what students learn will

/depend

depend in part upon how classroom communication is organised, that is, upon the part played by talk and writing in their learning. If their classroom role is that of passive receivers then this is what they will learn. On the other hand, if we want what we teach them to become part of their action knowledge, then we must set up classroom talk and writing so that they can explore its implications for living.

5. What issues might teachers interest themselves in to extend their understanding of language and learning? When one secondary school teacher heard of LAC he is said to have rubbed his hands and said, 'Splendid. A blitz on spelling, eh?' and this may prove not uncharacteristic of high school teachers of subjects other than English. When one begins to interest teachers in the topic, one can expect at first a tendency to look at the pupils' performance rather than at teaching, and to see this performance in terms of a limited set of conventional skills. High School teachers of science tend to be concerned at first with the readability of worksheets and textbooks, and to apply to them those mechanical formulae that carry the very appropriate names of FOG and SMOG, as if measuring readability will free them from the daunting problems of enabling children to understand the concepts that lie beneath the words. But if we begin with the issues our colleagues raise we can hope to lead them later to considering more important issues in classroom communication and the likely effects of this upon learning.

In the U.K. we have received during the last few years a series of shattering reminders that what teachers say and intend is not always what actually happens in lessons, and this mismatch between intention and reality is probably the most powerful lever by which we can persuade ourselves and others to embark upon the painful experience of change. Let me refer to three of these reminders. Professor Lunzer and his colleagues at Nottingham have shown in their study of reading practices in classrooms that reading does not play so important a role as one would have expected: "In most lessons, reading for learning seems to have a relatively minor role", they conclude from an observational study. The most frequent spurts of reading last for no more than 15 seconds, and this is true of a range of subjects

/and

and for students of different ages. Relatively infrequently are students expected to read at some length. Lunzer's work also provokes questions about the kinds of reading done: there does not seem to be a great deal of what he calls "the active interrogation of the text".

A second reminder came from Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools who recently carried out surveys of teaching in large samples of primary and secondary schools. In the Secondary School report from which I have already quoted they wrote:

"Although considerable research over the last 20 years ..... has emphasised the part that talking can play in learning, the evidence of the survey indicated that this is still not widely known among teachers. Pupils usually spent more time in reading and writing than they did in talking and listening; and in the oral exchanges between class and teacher very much more time listening than talking....."

We have much to do in persuading our colleagues about the importance of exploratory talk as a means of learning, and this is made more difficult by the incompleteness of our own understanding of the matter.

The Bullock Report says of British Primary Schools:

"For language to play its full role as a means of learning, the teacher must create in the classroom an environment that encourages a wide range of language uses. The effectiveness of this context for the purpose can be judged by the answers to a number of questions. For example, how often does a child share his personal interests and learning discoveries with others in the class? How far is the teacher able to enter such conversations without robbing children of verbal initiative? Are the children accustomed to read to one another what they have written, and just as readily listen? Are they accustomed to solving co-operatively in talk the practical problems that arise when they work together? How much opportunity is there for the kind of talk by which children make sense in their own terms of the information offered by teacher or by book?"

In a recent research report, Inside the Primary Classroom, the first

/of

of several to come from a team at the University of Leicester, the authors, Brian Simon and Maurice Galton, write that though they found primary school students sitting round small tables, this grouping was seldom used as a basis for learning activities.

"Our 'typical' pupil, though he talks with other members of his group....., generally experiences little, if any, co-operative or joint group work of any kind, whether exploratory, problem-solving, constructive, or creative." And this is in our celebrated primary schools.

It is salutary, if a little disturbing, to see ourselves mirrored in this way. I wonder whether your researchers when they observe classroom teaching, find a better match between intention and performance. Possibly not. However, it is by reflection on this kind of mismatch that teachers can most readily bring themselves to the point where they will attempt to change their teaching methods.

6. The Role of Linguistics

Having sketched some of the points where change might be possible, I want to turn for a moment to linguistics, to ask what kind of assistance LAC can expect from the specialist linguist. LAC is not concerned with the forms of language so much as with its use; its focus is not upon punctuation or conformity to written usage, but upon how students can be helped to make the most of what language they have. This is why, when I read William Gatherer's article on 'Language in Education' in Marland's book I feel that his emphasis falls wrongly, since it is largely concerned with the forms of language, and not with pedagogical questions. This is not to say that linguistics has nothing to offer. Teachers of reading and writing need to understand something about the relationship between spoken and written forms: that there is not a one-to-one relationship between symbols and sounds, for example, so that the sound represented by the letter 'l' in 'lot' is not the same as that represented by the same letter in 'halt'. Thus, as Courtney Cazden has pointed out, a child who writes 'dragon' as JRAGN shows an impressive mastery of English orthography.

/In my

In my view, however, it is sociolinguists have a great deal more to say to teachers that is relevant to LAC. We need go no further afield than the work done by Wallace Lambert and his associates at McGill on bilingualism and on the effect of speech styles on teachers' attitudes to their pupils to find work that is of crucial importance. As Michael Halliday said in Australia last year, if we ignore the work of sociolinguists "we can go on believing that there must be something wrong with the mental abilities and thought processes of all those children who speak non-standard English, or are foreigners, or are Aboriginal speakers, or whatever else ....."
(I hope that it will not seem discourteous in a guest to observe that it is more than strange that in a brochure describing a Canadian conference on LAC the word 'bilingual' does not occur. Such politically charged issues can surely not be avoided whenever teachers discuss language even within their own schools. But I must return to my theme.)

In spite of the ways in which linguists and sociolinguists can help teachers, we cannot hand over LAC to their guidance, and this is because they are interested in answering different questions from ours. We want to know how we can manage our students' talk, reading and writing so as to achieve optimum learning both in language and in other parts of the curriculum, and these are questions which linguistics can give us only limited help with.

7. Some Strategies for In-School Development of LAC

Finally I should like to turn to practical questions about how best to set about interesting colleagues in LAC. What we are doing, of course, is asking many of them to make a radical change in their role as teachers. Much teaching - much good teaching - is based upon habitual skills and intuitive judgments. But this alone is not enough. If a teacher is to grow and develop as a professional should, he (or she) needs to reflect upon the way he teaches. Chris Day, who is taking part in this conference, carried out research in Sussex which shows how effective systematic reflection can be as a basis for changing one's own teaching style; in our schools we need

/not

not just responsible professionals but reflective professionals who are continually considering what they do, its effect on pupils, and how it might match better what they are trying to do. This seems a more significant kind of self-evaluation than the booklets of questions which are said to represent school self-evaluation.

Now self-criticism is threatening. Barry MacDonald has said that classroom innovation deskills, that is, threatens teachers' habitual skills in managing their classes, so we shall be asking a great deal of our colleagues. Many will not want to listen to us when we threaten the safety of what is familiar: we shall certainly not be able to impose such changes upon them. I have been urging a view of learning that gives greater emphasis to students' own active participation. When we ask a group of teachers to reconsider the role of language in teaching and learning we must offer them a similar opportunity to engage in active inductive learning. It will be of little use laying down principles in a policy document: such documents gather dust in the teacher's desk. What we want is to change teaching. It is essential to involve ourselves and other teachers in heuristic, problem-solving activities, looking for answers to practical questions about language and learning. Unless each teacher learns for himself, LAC will be no more than yet another educational bandwagon.

During the last year or two I have organised several short courses for teachers interested in LAC, so I have faced the problem that you will have to face: how do you involve colleagues in activities designed to change some of their habitual teaching strategies? The schools I worked with found it best to set up voluntary working parties that carried out small enquiries. Some arranged for one of their number to follow a group of students around for a whole day or more to find what range of language experience they have; others collected all the written work done by children for a fortnight in order to find out what kinds of writing are done; yet others studied the language abilities and needs of a group of low-achieving students in order to reconsider how they might be helped; one high school interviewed all their older students about their experience of language and learning, and this

/gathered

gathered some uncomfortable truths. On the subject of teachers' questions, for example:

> Answers are expected which pupils consider too obvious.
>
> Some questions are ambiguously constructed, so that the pupils are confused as to what the teacher expects of them.
>
> Some teachers use questions as a weapon of humiliation.
>
> The smaller the group, the more likely pupils are to speak.

And so on. Some brave groups of teachers tape-recorded lessons on similar topics, and played parts of them back to one another in order to consider how far they had carried out their intentions. I need not continue to list these heuristic activities: there are others mentioned in the books by Mike Torbe and Michael Marland.

These activities are for working-parties of enthusiasts. What is the minimum that might be offered to all teachers, including those who would never join a voluntary working party? One would aim to draw the issues to their attention by a newsletter and by encouraging the working-parties in the school to let the rest of the teachers know what they are doing by occasional report-back sessions. One school near Leeds has organised two in-service courses on LAC: the enthusiasts have gathered materials and presented it to their colleagues for discussion in two series of evening meetings. As a minimum one might aim to see to it that all teachers have an opportunity to discuss examples of students talking and writing not in order to evaluate it but to consider what kinds are likely to encourage learning, and to look critically at their own role in setting up classroom contexts for talking and writing - how they set work, what their role as audience and reader might be, and so on.

I do not want to disguise the difficulty of asking teachers to change their professional roles. In high schools we face the additional barrier of what has been called "subject chauvinism", so that educational concerns that cut across subject boundaries are likely to be seen as of low priority.

8. I should like to end on a reflective note. I have never been quite clear whether I am arguing that exploratory talk and writing aids all learning - by helping learners to relate new knowledge to old - or whether I am making the weaker plea that it is essential to the kind of learning that I value, encouraging students to be active, critical, confident, ready to take responsibility for themselves. Perhaps I am arguing for both, but I want to end by emphasising the latter. One of the most frightening aspects of teaching, even of successful teaching, is that one finds one is developing a kind of induced dependency in one's students - and this may be true at any level from kindergarten to university. Good teaching should be designed to enable students in the long run to think for themselves and even some day to show us, their teachers, where we are wrong. We are calling this conference LAC, but we cannot avoid realising that we are really talking about the kind of human beings we want our young people to grow up to be, and about how we can set up classroom communication to help them be like that.

Education, I am glad to say, is a political activity: otherwise it could not be as important as it is. Issues such as bilingualism and the effect of teachers' linguistic prejudices must be central issues, here and elsewhere. Since the language used in schools will influence our students' futures, and play a part in allocating future power, riches and prestige, language policies are inevitably political. To be aware of the implications of the language used in his classroom is a responsibility no teacher can avoid.

Douglas Barnes,
University of Leeds.
August 1980.

REFERENCES

BRUNER, J.S. (1966) Toward a Theory of Instruction
Belknap Press, Harvard

CAZDEN, C.B. (1972) Child Language and Education
Holt Rinehart & Winston

FILLION, B. (1979) 'Language Across the Curriculum: examining the place of language in our schools' McGill Journal of Education 14:1, Winter 1979

DAY, C.W. (1979) Classroom-based In-service Education : The development and evaluation of a client-centred model Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Sussex

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1975)
A Language for Life (The Bullock Report) H.M.S.O.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1979)
Aspects of Secondary Education in England H.M.S.O.

GALTON, M., SIMON, B. AND CROLL, P. (1980) Inside the Primary Classroom
Routledge & Kegan Paul

GOODY, J. (1977) The Domestication of the Savage Mind
Cambridge U.P.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1979) 'Linguistics in Teacher Education' in Maling-Keepes J. and B.D. (eds.) Language in Education: The L.D.P. Phase 1
Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra

LAMBERT, W.R. (1972) Language, Psychology and Culture
Stanford University Press

LUNZER, E. and GARDNER, K. (1979) The Effective Use of Reading
Heinemann

MARLAND, M. (1977) Language Across the Curriculum
Heinemann

TORBE, M. (1980) Language Policies in Action
Ward Lock